

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated December 2, 2005. By said Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 11 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement and written description requirement.

In a telephone interview graciously granted by the Examiner and his supervisor David Fox, Applicant proposed the amendments to claims 1, 15 and 16 above, with claims 1, 2, 11, 15 and 16 remaining in the application.

In said interview, the Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments appeared to put the application in allowable condition, and requested formal submission of the amendments.

In view thereof, the allowance of claims 1, 2, 11, 15 and 16 is deemed to be in order and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Support for claims amendments (according to the published PCT WO 01/13708)

Claim 1:

“Hirsutum” can be found throughout the application e.g., Page 5 line 31.

“such that the fruit remains of the vine of said hybrid plants past the normal red ripe harvest stage” can be found in Page 6 lines 7-8.

Claims 15 and 16:

“genome” is supported by “genetic makeup” in Page 2 line 26.

“introgression” is supported as the outcome of classical genetic breeding techniques and molecular genetic techniques described in Page 2 lines 30-31.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan,
Registration No. 40,338